III. REMARKS

Applicant has considered the current Office Action with mailing date of May 1, 2007. Claims 1-32 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 11 and 22 have been amended. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office. The present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of these original claims and other claims in one or more subsequent patent application that claim(s) priority to the instant application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US 20020120918, hereinafter "Aizenbud", in view of US Patent No. 6732153, hereinafter "Jakobson." Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-32 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1 – 32 over Aizenbud in view of Jakobson, Applicant respectfully reiterates that the cited references, Aizenbud and Jakobson, independently or in combination do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

In addition to all previous arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest that the message is crafted by a developer in association with development of a computer program code and delivered by the computer program code to an end user in response to an event during execution of the computer program code. Rather the

messages in Aizenbud are generated by a computer, not a developer. Furthermore, rather than being crafted in association with development of a computer program code, the messages in Aizenbud, which the Examiner equates with the messages of the claimed invention are generated a run time. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references also fail to teach or suggest that the reviewing of the message is done during development of the program code. Rather, to the extent that the messages in Aizenbud are reviewed, it is during execution of a program and not during development. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Applicant continues to submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, "...wherein the review standard includes review parameters selected from a group consisting of: character limits, line limits, spell checks, grammar checks and a combination thereof ..." claim 1. In contrast, Aizenbud's message debugger is to track and/or edit the manner in which a message flows according to "the processing logic of a ... message flow diagram", ¶[0054]. As such Aizenbud's tracking and/or editing of message flow is not concerned with the natural language content of the message, but rather with the manner in which the message is delivered. The Examiner makes the argument that since the message processing nodes in Aizenbud can be customized, they could be customized in accordance with the review standard of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits that this statement constitutes Official Notice based on impermissible hindsight. Furthermore, as Aizenbud deals with the manner in which the message is delivered and not the natural language content of the message, this assertion is outside the realm of Aizenbud and has no support therein. Furthermore, nothing in Aizenbud suggests using any of the elements of the review standard of the claimed invention,

e.g., "…character limits, line limits, spell checks [and] grammar checks…" Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw this rejection.

Still further, Aizenbud fails to teach or suggest that the claimed message is crafted in a natural language and that the review standard is for natural language messages. Rather, the messages are from one computer to another and, as such are not in a natural language, but rather some computer messaging language. To this extent, any review of said messages would also be based on the same messaging language. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With further regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants also submit that it makes no sense to combine Aizenbud with Jakobson. The Office admits that Aizenbud is deficient in teaching the claimed feature of "…reviewing the message based on the review standard to detect errors…" claim 1. However, the Office asserts that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill to cure Aizenbud's deficiency with Jakobson. However, the two are directed to different fields of endeavor. In Aizenbud, it is the flow of a message that is being ascertained and not the structure thereof. Accordingly, while Jakobson includes a parsing step incorporating Jakobson's parsing step into the message mechanism of Aizenbud's still does change Aizenbud into a system that reviews linguistic aspects of a natural language message according to a review standard. Accordingly, a combination of Aizenbud and Jakobson, at best, parses each message but does not reviewed/analyzed the parsed message against review parameters, much less natural language review parameters. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique feature. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the use of references independently or in combination and/or modifications in rejecting the claimed subject matter. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 25, 2008

 /Hunter E. Webb/
Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

HEW